
1970s

The Gavel

10-1973

1973 Vol. 22 No. 4

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_gavel1970s

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Recommended Citation

Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, "1973 Vol. 22 No. 4" (1973). 1970s. 68.
https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/lawpublications_gavel1970s/68

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the The Gavel at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in 1970s by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.



THE LAW

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LAW

NOVEMBER, 1973

VOLUME 22 NUMBER 4

THE OBJECTIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING LAW OR THE WAY OUT OF AN ACADEMIC MESS by Jim Burge

I have often likened the law student to a woman or man who is sent upon a journey without the obvious advantages of being told of his destination or of being given a map. This may sound paradoxical; but, a close examination of the facts will reveal that the analogy is at least partially valid. In truth, the law student is rarely if ever told what are the objectives of his courses of study; and, as it would follow, he is likewise almost never informed as to how to achieve them.

Experience will show that in most law school courses primary emphasis is placed on covering a specific quantity of material. This, I submit, is a goal which can be met without realizing the obvious objective of the course, the learning of the related law. Note the standard procedure. The student is assigned to read the casebook, the students and the instructor then comment upon the contents of the book; and finally, after all of this is completed, the student is given an examination to measure his ability to verbalize in reacting to unreal fact patterns with legal jargon. The process is counter-productive *per se*.

It is my thesis that the use of the educational objective could solve some of the problems of this academic farce by giving direction to both the instructor and to the student in the processes of teaching and learning law. I also submit that the use of the educational objective could serve to reduce the subjectivity of law school examinations, and, thereby increase their validity.

The educational objective is an attempt to describe learning outcomes in terms of measurable, observable behavior. The instructor can use these descriptions to acquaint the student with just what it is that the student should be trying to achieve in a course of study. Examples of law-related objectives would be the following:

It is an objective of this course (or unit of study) that the student be able to list the elements of a cause of action for negligence and be able to apply these elements to a given set of facts

in discussing in a few short paragraphs whether or not, under the facts presented, a cause of action exists; or,

It is an objective of this course (or unit of study) that the student be able to define the concept of the "offer" as it relates to a contract and be able to apply this concept to a given set of facts in discussing in a few short paragraphs whether or not under the facts presented, an offer to enter a contract has been made by a party.

After being presented with the course or unit objective, it should be clear to the student exactly what his goal or goals should be in behavioral terms, and he can direct his behavior accordingly. By keeping this objective in mind, the instructor can also focus his teaching methods and materials on helping the student to achieve this common goal. In light of the stated objective, non-productive or counter-productive activities can be omitted by both the student and the instructor.

The instructor will also find that the educational objective he has stated will be helpful to him when the time comes to construct a test that will measure whether or not the student can elicit the behavior stated in the objective. Test questions which would measure the behavior requested in the example objectives above should be obvious.

It follows that the student should also find the educational objective helpful to him as he prepares for the examination. Since he will know the type of performance that is expected of him, he can practice the skills necessary to perfect his performance.

In summary, the educational objective is nothing more than common sense, economical method of directing the energies of the student and instructor to meet a common goal. The idea assuredly is not original with me. I had to learn how to use it. I am sure others can also. The objective method is not offered as a cure-all for the many problems of education, legal and other. But, the use of the educational objective in the law school classroom does seem to be a desirable alternative to the traditional methods of course design.

by Bruce Rose

Those who have watched the Watergate hearings must by now be impressed with an important lesson which has been virtually ignored by leading commentators. The lesson is this. Many, if not most, of those who have testified have been and still are jokers. True, they are serious but that is why they are so laughable. Who was the most serious? John Erlichman perhaps. That man meant business. (In fact Erlich in old German does mean business) And he was downright ludicrous. This leads us to the Fool Rule:

"When people take themselves too seriously they run the risk of becoming ludicrous."

This is true for all people from all walks of life. It has especial significance at a law school where getting down to business is the name of the game. I have seen people become vehement in discussing the pros and cons of comparative vs. contributory negligence; the police power of the state vs the right to contract even what is more impressive- being on Moot Court or SBA. We are encourage to practice being serious today to prepare for future real serious issues.

And as a result of this process we are as a group incredibly boring. Our husbands and wives, lovers, and friends hesitate to tell us this because we work so hard and are so serious about being so boring. We are destroying our personal relationships, by improving ourselves.

What can we do? Look at yourself in a mirror occasionally. Then laugh. Outloud. Hard. Other people laugh at you, why shouldn't you?

Admit you are silly today to prevent being ludicrous tomorrow.

The following poem was presented to The Gavel under the dubious pseudonym of John Marshall. It was submitted in the hopes of being eventually printed. Here it is-to John Marshall- wherever you are.

the Old Grind

Briefing cases,
MY GOD there are THOUSANDS
of people/good, bad & brilliant/
that spend their time briefing cases
spend their time

WADING through long dusty material
pouncing upon the satisfaction
of a HUMAN glimmer stone
among the dead heap

ash pile-BUT
I suppose
that's a manner of looking

PERSPECTIVE/ATTITUDE
it helps in the moment
any one of those
/good, bad & brilliant/
people stop short,
EXAMINE,
look at
their life turned
aside from the business of living

Moot Court Fall Exercise
Arguments are scheduled,
check in the Moot Court
Office.



RADICAL LAWYER TURNED JUDGE TO SPEAK AT CSU

Judge Justin C. Ravitz of the Detroit Recorder's Court, the first political radical of the 1970's to be elected to an American criminal court bench, will lecture at The Cleveland State University Wednesday, November 14.

In an Assembly Lecture Series program, Judge Ravitz will speak beginning at 2 p.m. in CSU's Main Classroom Building Main Auditorium, 1899 E. 22nd St. His talk is free and open to the public.

After graduation from the University of Michigan Law School, Ravitz, now 32, became what he calls a "people's lawyer." He spent most of his time on cases which reflected what he saw as society's oppression of individuals.

He campaigned on that theme last fall, and on the theme that courts must become less rigid and more responsive to individuals, and won easily.

Judge Ravitz, who would like to see American society become more like Cuba or China, has gained respect as a most careful adjudicator of the law, winning himself high marks from many Detroit lawyers and prosecutors.

"I can't stay in this institution if I flout its laws, if I become a hippie radical on the bench," he told William K. Stevens of the New York Times. "So I adhere to their law. In the process to a small but nonetheless significant extent, I hope I can lessen the oppression this system inflicts."

Stevens described Judge Ravitz's courtroom demeanor as follows:

"To Judge Ravitz, American society is still an ongoing class struggle between those who own and those who don't own," and he is resolutely on the side of the non-owners. He allows no American flag in what he calls his 'people's court.' No one stands when he comes into the room. There is no clerk's cry of 'Oyez, Oyez, Oyez,' no opening-of-court ritual at all. On a typical day the judge ascends to the bench robeless, chewing on a toothpick, his tie loosened.

"But when court begins, the image of relaxed radical utterly dissolves.

"Judge Ravitz is all business in the role of judge. Speaking quietly in a low, somewhat soft voice, he conducts his court with what appears to a layman to be a high degree of seriousness, strict adherence to the law and the facts, and fidelity to quite unradical principles and precedents of American jurisprudence."

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE DOUGLAS SETS RECORD

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas passed a milestone last week in becoming the member of the country's highest court longer than any Justice in history—34 years and 196 days. The 75 year old jurist remarked that, He saw "no particular virtue in longevity per se". Justice Douglas's record tenure will more than likely not be his most noted characteristic. He is likely to be best known as the Court's loner. In his tenure on the court, he has been the target for impeachment three times—however—his dissent in many cases has later become the majority opinion.

When asked which of the thousands of decisions that he had participated in have had the most impact on the country and its citizens Mr. Justice Douglas thought for several minutes and said, "I suppose the opinions that have made the greatest impact in a dramatic way would be the reapportionment cases—Reynolds v. Sims, which (former Chief Justice) Warren based on a dissent Black and I had written 20 years earlier.

Justice Douglas was a practicing lawyer in New York City and the state of Washington a law professor at Columbia and Yale Universities; and chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He has authored over thirty books. The Supreme Court Justice is an avid world traveler and wilderness hiker. In commenting on his four day work week he noted, "Those three days with nothing to do much except take a walk, go out west on a trek, go to Europe, fly down to Knoxville for three days in the Smokies—these times of being away from the desk are a time when you are digesting a lot of things that have come in during those four days. It's one of the best decision-making processes: at the end of a 25-mile hike, your work is pretty well done."

Commenting on the future of America, Justice Douglas said, "I think the heart of America is sound, the conscience of America is bright and the future of America is great. The thing that holds all of us together is not the wording of the Constitution or the separation of powers, it's the mucilage of good will."



Rep. James Celebrezze will speak on the new Ohio Criminal Code Monday November 12 at 4:00 pm in the Main Classroom Building.

DELTA THETA PHI announces a rush party for all Law Students. FREE booze. FREE refreshments. Good Times. Thursday, November 15 at 8:00 til ? at Fagan's Beacon House 996 Old River Road. Bring your wives, dates, or go stag. See you there.



CHASING THE PAPER

by Clem N. Barney

20th Century Fox as part of a nationwide marketing program has been screening its latest release, "The Paper Chase", at major universities throughout this great land of ours. Last week the film made its Cleveland debut at CWRU's Strosacker Auditorium. Due to the special nature of this movie and its particular relevance to those of us, here, wallowing in the law, it seems that a review of its contents might be appropriate.

In case you had not heard "Paper Chase" is a film about a horrendous experience that we here all endured or are in the process of enduring- the first year of law school. The film is set at that great bastion of legal tradition, Harvard Law School, better known as The Marshall of the East. It opens with the first day of contracts class where Hart, very aptly portrayed by Timothy Bottoms, of "Last Picture Show" fame, is called on to brief the first case. Realistically enough he's not prepared. Professor Kingsfield, played by famed director-producer turned actor John Houseman, proceeds to humiliate Hart as only a law professor can, causing young Hart to rush to the men's room immediately after class and blow lunch.

From such an auspicious start the film gains momentum. Hart, naturally falls in love with a beautiful young woman, who he later discovers, much to his dismay, is not only already married but the daughter of arch enemy, Kingsfield. This is one instance of stretching reality a bit too far to add an interesting dramatic touch.

The film then proceeds along its merry way until final exam time in a fairly humorous fashion. Study groups are formed and dissolved. Students drop by the wayside. One even tries to kill himself. The mythology and aura surrounding Professor Kingsfield blossom and grow. Hart rebounds from his first day of humiliation and unpleasantness to enter the uppermost echelon of his contracts class-- the talkers--and even becomes the number one star. Meanwhile his love affair with Susan, sputters onward. But no matter how hard he struggles, no matter what he does, Hart is unable to penetrate beyond Kingsfield, the professor, and into Kingsfield, the man.

The film is plain entertainment and not much more. It merely uses the first year of law school as the medium through which it entertains. It is not trying to make a comment on what that first year is or should be about. Instead it points to the silly side of it all, which in the midst of the tradition and competition that is Harvard, is a highly laudable feat. Taken in this context the film, somehow, works.

The performances are, on the whole, excellent. Timothy Bottoms is a highly believable Hart. Identification with him is almost impossible to avoid. Houseman, as Kingsfield, in his first acting role, if maybe a bit overplayed at times, is generally excellent. Haven't we all had our own personal Kingsfield?

Lindsey Wagner, the daughter-lover, is not quite as convincing as the other two but certainly more than adequate. As for the smaller parts: Craig Richard Nelson as Liberty Bell and Regina Baff as Asheley do particularly commendable jobs.

The movie could be more than it is but it doesn't attempt to be. Instead it must be taken as it was intended-- a light, fairly entertaining comedy. This is what James Bridges, the film's director set out to create and it is what he has accomplished. For a law student it has many moments of laughter and identifiable realities, but I'm not so sure it would seem so funny to one who has never heard of a Carbollic smokeball. Anyhow, at the Strosacker showing, it was well worth the price of admission. My name is Clem N. Barney

STUDENT BAR ASSOCIATION

by Jeff Kelleher

Among some students and faculty there appears a current of opinion that the SBA is an ineffective, even doing nothing organization. It is hoped that this and subsequent articles will allay those suspicions while providing a summary of recent activities and projects being carried on under SBA auspices.

The SBA is foremost the vehicle within which student opinion and criticism is carried to the faculty and administration. A newly improved system of reporting to the SBA Senate by student representatives on faculty committees and the resulting feedback will allow for timely expression of student feelings in these forums. It is crucial for instance, that students' concerns be heard on such issue as scheduling and the new law facility and on chronic problems such as that of tenure.

In order to provide that student views are accurately reflected the SBA office is open daily and all senators and officers are available to hear those views and present them at SBA meetings.

The SBA's effectiveness is manifested in other, more tangible ways. The orientation program was again an unqualified success. The book exchange met expectations and should improve as it is continued next quarter. The student lounge and the lockers are SBA projects. The Watergate Speak-Out program was cosponsored by the SBA. (It is noteworthy that of an otherwise disappointing crowd nearly half were law students and faculty.)

There are several important issues currently before the SBA. How can the Law School afford a slick alumni quarterly and yet slash "Gavel" funds and threaten a cut in Law Review funds? Why did the Dean summarily foil an attempt to make use of the center courtyard?

Why doesn't the Law School receive from CSU an amount proportionate to the amount the students put in? What has become of a million dollar Cleveland Marshall trust fund?

The SBA hopes to speed resolution of these and many other problems affecting the entire law school. In line with this SBA President Carl Noll has made and Dean Christensen accepted an invitation to speak to students and field questions. This will take place November 14 at 5:00 PM in the lounge.

For those who wish to follow the conduct of business by the SBA, its minutes are posted on the bulletin board in the basement. Familiarization with SBA activities and consequent input by students in general will serve to heighten the effectiveness of this organization.

WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

Mr. Agnew, former vice-president and critic of judicial "permissiveness" and suspended sentences, eventually struck a bargain with the Justice Department in which he resigned and pleaded no contest to one count of income tax evasion to stay out of prison. It seems that Mr. Agnew's attorneys have sought advice from Jack Levine and Charles Nesson in hopes of blocking the Grand Jury investigation of Agnew's financial dealings.

Jack Levine, a Philadelphia lawyer long associated with radical causes, was asked about moves he had made in the successful defense of Sister Joques Egan, who had refused to testify before the grand jury investigating Father Berrigan. Mr. Levine has stated that the questions were about whether Mr. Agnew had standing for an appeal to block the investigation. Charles Nesson, a Harvard law school professor, had worked on the defense of Dr. Ellsberg. The lawyers for Mr. Agnew asked Mr. Nesson about motions he had made in seeking to block a Boston grand jury during the Pentagon Papers case. Mr. Nesson sent the Agnew lawyers the briefs.

The Nixon administration has begun a long series of grand jury investigations of radical groups, primarily through the Justice Department's Internal Security Division. These inquiries have engendered much debate within the legal community over whether the Grand Jury System is being abused. In response to these sweeping investigations, defenders of dissenters such as the National Lawyers Guild, the Center for Constitutional Rights and the American Civil Liberties Union have formed study groups that are developing legal expertise in defending against grand jury inquiries.

TALES FROM THE COURTYARD

by Ted Meckler

If you were particularly observant on Tuesday, October 9, you may have noticed that several picnic tables sat, innocently enough, in the midst of the lovely courtyard that graces our law school with its presence somewhere in the middle of all those pretty bricks. If you passed by that bit of nature in our midst, again, soon after having seen the tables, you might have noticed that

they had mysteriously disappeared.

This story began on orientation day when Dean Craig Christenson and SBA President Carl Noll chatted about the potential functions and uses of that courtyard. The Dean noted that originally the plan had called for a garden type courtyard. But Campus Planning determined that the cost of such a project would be prohibitive and scrapped the idea. Not to be denied, the Dean planned to go outside the University, to our noble and rich alumni, to try and find some money to do it up right.

Carl told the Dean that he felt something in the courtyard would be better than an empty, unusable patch of asphalt. In following up that belief Carl got in touch with Mr. Glade of the University Physical Plant to see, if perhaps, the University might have some cost-free picnic tables in storage. Mr. Glade told Carl that he was not certain about the availability of picnic tables but that he would check on it and get back to Carl soon. The Dean upon hearing of Carl's attempts reiterated his position that the courtyard should be furnished aesthetically and not become some "trash nest" or "rubbish pile."

As luck would have it Mr. Glade found the tables and sent them to the law school, free of charge, on the aforementioned date of October 9, without first checking with Carl or Craig. The Dean upon learning of the delivery of these unauthorized tables and, presumably, feeling them not to be up to his aesthetic guidelines, had them removed and replaced into storage. (I can almost hear those movers, now.) Entering into the Dean's decision was the fact that, as of yet, the courtyard is locked up and unavailable for use because of fire access problems. It has not been cleared for use with the fire marshall.

At the close of this little escapade neither Carl, nor the Dean were particularly pleased with one another. They reiterated their former positions. The Dean is still trying to tag the alumni and the University for some money. He feels that if we manage to get by with just the picnic tables it would weigh heavily against the chances of these two income sources shelling out any money for a courtyard at our temporary law school. He thinks that his quest for money will probably be successful in time for spring. Only time will tell. Meanwhile the courtyard sits barren.

IS THE ADMINISTRATION PHASING OUT THE NIGHT SCHOOL AT CLEVELAND-MARSHALL?

by Chris Stanley

My answer to this question is yes, the administration led by Dean Christensen is indeed phasing out the night school. The only evidence I have which supports my hypothesis are inferences reasonably drawn from the following two facts:

1) The proportion of day students to night students in the first year class is 207 day to 178 night. Last year the ratio was even, and before that, the night school was always bigger than the day school.

2) The schedule from which night school students must choose from is intolerable. A night student who carries ten hours of credit, at a minimum, must spend four nights a week at C.S.U. And another result of the splitting of three credit courses into two $1\frac{1}{2}$ hour classes is that the probabilities are good that a night student will be going to school on Friday night.

The inferences which can be drawn from these facts can best be phrased in questions: 1) Why is it that the day school can accommodate 29 extra students using the same teachers and same classrooms? Certainly this school did not lack applicants. Surely there are 29 people who would qualify to enter C.S.U.

2) Are the pedagogical reasons for the intolerable schedule the discouragement of people to go to law school at night. Does the dean feel handicapped by the night school in his efforts for C.S.U. to gain national prominence as a law school? Now that the Ohio State legislature has granted the money for the new law school building (which means that Dino doesn't need the alumni as much) will we phase out the night school as all "good" law schools have.

The reasons why night schools must be kept are self-evident. More are needed. Otherwise, law as a profession would limit itself to the rich and middle class white male people who can afford to go to school full time without working.

Naturally the dean is going to deny this hypothesis for one of two reasons - 1) The night school is not being phased out; 2) it is being phased out but the dean doesn't want anyone to know just yet.

FAMILY LAW ESSAY CONTEST ENTRIES FROM LAW STUDENT DUE IN APRIL

Junior and senior-year law students have until April 15 to enter the 1974 Howard C. Schwab Memorial Award Essay Contest in the field of Family Law. The contest is sponsored by the American Bar Association's Family Law Section in cooperation with the Toledo and Ohio Bar Associations.

Contestants may write on any aspect of Family Law. Suggested length is about 3,000 words. Essays that have been, or are, scheduled to be published are ineligible for consideration.

First, second and third prize winners will receive awards of cash in the amounts of \$500, \$300, and \$200, respectively. The winners will be announced and the prizes will be awarded during the Family Law Section's 1974 annual meeting in Honolulu.

The contest is intended to create a greater interest in the field of Family Law among U.S. law students, particularly members of the ABA Law Student Division. All junior and senior-year law students enrolled in ABA-approved law schools are eligible, except employees of the American, Ohio or Toledo Bar associations.

The contest is named after the late Howard C. Schwab, chairman-elect of the ABA Family Law Section at the time of his death in 1969. He was a past president of the Toledo Bar Association and past chairman of the Ohio State Association's Family Law Committee.

Law Students who wish to enter the essay contest should request an entry form from: Howard C. Schwab Memorial Award Essay Contest, Section of Family Law, American Bar Association, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago, Ill. 60637

LOOKING FOR A JOB?

Final year students:

Thursday, November 15 9:00 a.m.-6:00 p.m.
U.S. Internal Revenue Service, Cleveland
District Director's Office (Tom Cocce)

Second year students:

Tuesday, November 12
Internal Revenue Service Regional Counsel
See correspondence and turn in SF 171 if interested.



Richard Musat, Editor-in-Chief
Burr Anderson, Executive Editor

Andrea Kleinhenz, Assistant to the editors
Tom Buckley, Faculty Advisor

THE GAVEL STAFF: Ted Meckler, Bruce Rose, Chris Stanley and Barara Stern
THE VIEWS EXPRESSED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE NEWSPAPER OR ITS BYLINED REPORTERS.
UNLESS SPECIFICALLY STATED, THEY DO NOT REFLECT THE VIEWS OF ANYONE ELSE.

Recently JoAnne Minarcini and I became aware of a restriction that prohibits a student from taking more than one clinical program. We stumbled upon this restriction quite by accident i.e. through a student who had been refused registration in a clinical program this fall because she had already taken the sex discrimination clinic the previous year. None of the instructors in the clinical programs, that we subsequently talked to, were aware of the restriction. We went to the Dean's office to discover if we would encounter a similar impediment since Ms. Minarcini and I were planning on taking the sex discrimination clinic plus another clinic. Minutes of the administration's prior meetings were brought out and two resolutions were discovered: one from last year stated that no more than one clinical program per student was allowed; and, the second, from less than a month ago, stated that a maximum of 18 clinical hours were allowed. Ms. Minarcini was precluded from taking more than one clinic by either resolution since she wanted the criminal clinic, which is 18 hours, in addition to the sex discrimination clinic. However, I wanted the civil clinic, 10 hours, and the sex discrimination clinic, 4 hours. This total of 14 hours complied with the second resolution. I was told that this discrepancy between the resolutions had never been noticed and would have to be discussed at the next administrative meeting. On November 6 I was informed that the first resolution would be followed-- I would have to choose one clinic. At no time was any reason for this decision given to me. However, this very same administration published a catalogue last year which described in eloquent and progressive terms the criminal and sex discrimination clinics that this law school offered. No mention of one precluding the other was made. They even concluded their little tribute (p.38) to their clinical programs with the following: "Finally, students are afforded a wide choice of other seminars and institutes with clinical components in various areas of law and practice."

An interesting by-product of this November 6th meeting did result though. One modification was allowed: any student who had already taken the sex discrimination clinic would be allowed to take another clinic. Hence, students who had proceeded in blissful ignorance were rewarded while we were penalized for a good faith inquiry.

Other restrictions in these clinical programs are also applied in an arbitrary manner. For example, this past summer one student enrolled in the criminal clinic was allowed to carry 21 hours including 12 hours of the criminal clinic. The rule for the criminal clinic is that no student may take any other course while taking the second twelve hour part. Ms. Minarcini is taking 18-19 hours per quarter so that she may comply with the restriction. When we asked why the student was allowed to forego the restriction we were simply told, "He had a waiver.". Ms Minarcini ranks in the upper 5% of the second year class so academic prowess

was certainly not the distinction between the two students. It is hard to conceive of any other relevant distinction.

Problems with the civil clinic also appeared. If you inspect the color-coded sheets you've been receiving each quarter you will discover that on each green, day, spring one a beginning civil clinic is listed (5T designates beginning) . This week I discovered through another administrative error (the wrong permission slip was mailed to me), which I went to investigate, that there was no civil clinic starting in the spring. Several other interested students and I immediately talked to the professors involved. The administration had not informed the clinic professors that they were having a spring clinic. An emergency meeting was held and a civil clinic will be offered this spring in compliance with the course schedule. Would the same result have happened had the error gone unnoticed until spring?

This is what Ms. Minarcini and I find extremely irksome-- a complete lack of authoritative material that a student may follow in drafting his or her program. At the beginning of the school year we were informed by our registration materials that schedules of all three quarters were enclosed so we could plan our entire year. This we have both attempted to do but the administrative ineptness has continually thwarted us: the schedules have errors; there are restrictions that exist only in the administration's minutes and are unknown to both students and faculty and the law school's current catalogue usually appears five to six months after school has begun (March this year).

It does appear that the administration is doing a good job of discouraging students from taking the sex discrimination clinic. After all, how many students are willing to sacrifice 10-18 hours of clinical credit for four? This is the clinic that bears the brunt of the prohibition as almost no student could combine the other two clinics. And when the other clinics combine who will be able to sacrifice a civil-criminal clinic for the small sex discrimination clinic? I could find no rational reason for the administration's forcing so many of us to forego the sex discrimination clinic. If they have a rational reason for denying us the right to choose our own areas of relevant academic study, I wish they would have the courtesy to express it to both me and the student body.

There is another class of students presumably affected by this ruling. One second year student spent the summer participating in the well known Denver, Colorado clinical program. He also planned to take the sex discrimination clinic (yes, men are affected too--you'd be surprised at how many are taking the sex discrimination course) but is also foreclosed

Irvin, LEGAL CLINICS

ed from doing so under the "one clinic" rule unless he can fit into the "blissful ignorance" exception.

These clinics are apparently not overcrowded either. Ms. Minarcini was told that she is one of two students taking the spring/summer criminal clinic. There are signs around the entire law school announcing available openings in both clinics' winter/spring programs. The sex discrimination clinic is in an odd middle position. There are not enough students enrolled to expand the clinic but there are too many for its present capabilities. Thus, if more students signed up, everyone interested could take it this winter, but if not, some students will be cut. The sex discrimination clinic does not begin until winter quarter. At this point in time Ms. Minarcini, myself and others are not being permitted to take this program. Thus, there is still time (approximately two months) for concerned faculty and students to bring support for our position before the administration. We have been treated summarily by this administration and with notice by our own inadvertence rather than by any sense of fair play on their part. If all full-fledged and neophyte lawyers in the law school do not appreciate the inequity being performed here then that should demonstrate more than anything else a sad need for relevance in a law school education.

Concerning the clinical programs in general, perhaps the problem lies in the lack of accessibility to the student. In my own case I am somewhat battle fatigued having spent the entire week fighting for the privilege of taking one (or more) clinics. Do I know if I am in a clinic for sure yet? As of my last discussion with the civil clinic I will be able to take the spring/summer clinic but like Chicken Little I keep waiting for the sky to fall in.

The faculty meeting was called to order on Oct. 26 by Dean Christensen. Administrative announcements included the fact that Ms. Picker was attending an International Law conference in Moscow and that faculty members should submit notices and announcements to the Cleveland-Marshall Law Notes, the law school public relations newsletter to the legal community.

In the order of new business the curriculum committee proposed and the faculty approved the following credit-hour changes in courses: Real Estate Practice 3 to 4 hrs.

Trial Procedure 3 to 4 hrs.

A new course in Suretyship was proposed and accepted by the faculty (2 hrs.).

The Graduate Studies Committee proposed and the faculty adopted the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That henceforth candidates for the Master of Laws (or Master of Laws in Advocacy) degree shall be permitted to take as many as eight of their credit hours of course work in the graduate programs of the Cleveland State University other than the College of Law with the specific course to be approved on an individual basis by the Graduate Studies Committee.

There was an academic debate over the issues legal ethics and professional responsibility. The Curriculum Committee is in the process of framing the requirements of such a course. The faculty decided that a required course was necessary (2to1).

The Continuing Legal Education Committee proposed a series of ideas and programs to enrich the Cleveland legal community on new developments in the law. Two courses were approved in this regard, The new Federal Rules of Bankruptcy and the new Criminal Code and Rules of Procedure.



Cleveland State University

AN INCOMPLETE, FIRST REACTION REPLY TO

Irvin ON "LEGAL CLINICS"

by Carroll Sierk

On May 25, 1973, the faculty of the college of law adopted the following resolution recommended by its curriculum committee (which does have a student member and a student alternate):

RESOLVED: That commencing with the Fall Quarter 1973, no student shall be permitted to enroll for credit in more than one of the following clinical programs: Civil Clinical Program, Sex Discrimination Clinic and Criminal Clinical Practice. Students presently enrolled in such programs shall be excepted from this requirement.

This is a faculty policy, duly adopted by the faculty in a regular faculty meeting. In view of the effects of this policy on the Sex Discrimination Clinic which Ms. Irvin points out, perhaps the policy should be changed. But surely, unless and until the faculty changes the policy the administration has no right to ignore it; indeed it has a duty to enforce it.